STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION October 28, 2020

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, October 28, 2020, was called to order at 4:30 PM by Chairman Steven Apicella, in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center and at remote locations throughout the County.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steven Apicella (remote), Darrell English, Barton Randall, Albert Bain,

Kristen Barnes (remote), Dexter Cummings, Fillmore McPherson

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Harvey, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Kathy Baker, Brian Geouge

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes and I will be participating today from a remote location...

Mr. Randall: Steven, you're cutting in and out.

Mr. McPherson: Steve, can you hear us?

Mr. English: Go ahead. Alright I'm going to go ahead and take it over until he comes back on. I call the meeting to order at 4:30. You got it Steven?

Mr. Apicella: *Inaudible*... motion to approve our electronic participation?

Mr. McPherson: So moved.

Mr. Apicella: And to do so I'll ask for a voice vote. All those in favor say aye.

Mr. Bain: Aye.

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Mr. Cummings: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. McPherson: Aye.

Mr. Randall: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. I just, I'm here can you hear me?

Mr. English: Yeah, you go ahead, we gotcha.

Mr. Apicella: Can, can you hear me?

Mr. English: Yes, we can hear you. Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Okay so great. I've got two more points to make. *Inaudible...* and when voting on motions it'll be done by roll call vote.

Mr. English: Hey Steven, we're not... you're breaking up bad if you can hear us. We're having issues, Steven?

Mr. Apicella: *Inaudible...* technical issues like we just had, Mr. English will take over as Chair for me. Mr. Randall... *inaudible*, *bad connection*.

Mr. English: Okay, Mr. Apicella can you hear us now?

Mr. Apicella: I can and ask if you can hear me?

Mr. English: Yes, go ahead, you can take it over now. We have a quorum.

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. English. Are there any declarations or disqualifications on any agenda item? Okay seeing none we'll move on. I don't believe there are any changes to the agenda so I'll open the public presentations portion of tonight's meeting. The public may have up to three minutes to comment on any matter except the public hearing items on today's agenda, I'm sorry there are no public hearing items. So, if you are interested in commenting please come forward. When doing so state your name and address before commenting. When the clock shows a green light, you have three minutes to speak, yellow means there's one-minute left and red means you need to wrap up your comments. If there's anybody in the chambers who would like to speak please come forward now. Okay seeing no one I'm gonna close the public presentations portion of today's meeting and I'm gonna ask Mr. Harvey to talk to us about the first item on the agenda Amendments to the Comp Plan and Zoning Ordinance under Unfinished Business, Mr. Harvey.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

NONE

PUBLIC HEARINGS

NONE

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. <u>Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance</u> - Discuss proposed Resolution R20-81 and proposed Ordinance O20-20 to amend the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance for the Implementation of the Board of Supervisors Healthy Growth Strategic Plan Priority. (History: PC Work Session October 7, 2020) (BOS-PC Joint Public Hearing October 29, 2020)

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. As you may well know that the Planning Commission is holding a joint public hearing with the Board of Supervisors tomorrow night on this matter. It's a joint hearing for a proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance with regards to the Board of Supervisors Healthy Growth Strategy. The overall amendments would make some recommended changes that our agricultural areas be designated primarily for farming and forestry, but housing be permitted in situations where substantial lands for farming and forestry can be preserved. Also, with the Code Amendment it looks at changing the current three-acre lot minimum size for

conventional subdivisions to an allocated density of one house per ten acres. That still retains a three-acre minimum lot size but affects the number of lots that can be yielded. The number of lots that can be yielded would be reduced based on the density of the property that can be obtained. Also, with cluster development one and half acre sized lots could continue to be allowed but also must fall under that density requirement. So that is the update until tomorrow evening at 6:30 pm at Colonial Forge High School.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Harvey. Okay we will move on to the next item under New Business, the Jessup Reverse Frontage Waiver.

NEW BUSINESS

2. <u>WAI20153486</u>; Jessup Reverse Frontage Waiver - A request for a waiver of the Subdivision Ordinance, Sec. 22-151, Reverse Frontage, to allow for two lots with separate driveways on a major collector road for a proposed subdivision on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 27-18 and 27-18E. (Time Limit: December 27, 2020)

Mr. Harvey: Yes Mr. Chairman, this is a request for a reverse frontage waiver and Mr. Brian Geouge will be making the presentation for staff.

Mr. Geouge: Thank you Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. Brian Geouge, the Planning and Zoning Department. Tonight, I am presenting a waiver request from the Subdivision Ordinance, specifically Section 22-1512, titled Reverse Frontage, to allow for two lots with separate driveways on a major collector road. The parcel numbers are 27-18 and 27-18E, the total area is 13.24 acres. The applicant is Charles Jessup, and this is in the Hartwood District. The subject property is shown here, outlined here in red. The property is currently zoned A-1, Agricultural, and is located on the east side of Poplar Road between Stefaniga Rd and Branch Creek Way. Long Branch creek forms the southern boundary of the property. Here is an aerial photograph of the property. There is one existing singlefamily home on Parcel 27-18. The driveway for the existing home connects to Poplar Road through the corner of Parcel 27-13, shown here. Parcel 28-18E is undeveloped and wooded and there is a floodplain and 100-foot Resource Protection Area along Branch Creek. This waiver request is associated with an application for a boundary line adjustment and minor subdivision on the property, which is shown here. The proposed subdivision would consist of four lots, with three 3-acre lots and one 4.24-acre lot. Access to Parcel A would be through an existing ingress/egress easement through parcel 27-18F to Stefaniga Road, I will highlight here on the plan. Parcel B is to be served by a proposed private access easement located at the north end of parcel 27-18. The existing single-family home on parcel 27-18 would be retained, however, access to the home would be shifted slightly south on Poplar Road so that it lies entirely within parcel 27-18. So, here is the current alignment and it would be realigned approximately to here. With this proposal... yes sir.

Mr. Bain: So, that would be a shared driveway entrance for parcel A... inaudible, microphone not on.

Mr. Geouge: For parcel B.

Inaudible, microphone not on.

Mr. English: You will get a minute Mr. Jessup. Okay, go ahead.

Mr. Geouge: So, the applicant would continue using the majority of the existing driveway for the existing home on the property. The other parcel fronting Poplar Road, 27-18E, would be served by a separate driveway off of Poplar. Since Poplar Road is classified as a major collector road, Subdivision Ordinance Sec. 22-151, "Reverse frontage," would apply to this subdivision. This section states that subdivisions adjacent to primary, collector or arterial roads must contain reverse frontage lots except in cases where the agent has determined that lots have a disadvantage as far as orientation and topography, this is an administrative waiver process. So, basically the reverse frontage requirement is intended to require the construction of internal streets within subdivisions, adjacent to these major roadways. And this would minimize the number of access points on the roadway. If the agent waives the requirement, then, as a requirement of approval, all lots must utilize shared driveways. However, in this case, since the applicant desires to utilize the existing driveway, it makes that difficult because that is not in a practical location to share with the other adjacent property on Poplar Road. And for this reason, I would a waiver of this section from the Planning Commission is required. Section 22-241 of the Subdivision Ordinance states that in order for a waiver to be granted, the applicant must demonstrate that the ordinance requirements would impose an unreasonable burden on the owner, and that the waiver does not have any substantial adverse impact on future residents of the subdivision or adjoining property owners. And staff therefore recommends that the Planning Commission makes a determination based on the information provided. And that concludes my presentation.

Mr. English: Okay, anybody have any questions for staff? Okay...

Mr. Randall: I have a quick question. So, Mr. Geouge, what is Poplar Road look like with the... where they want to put the new driveway? What to Poplar look like? Is it straight, is is turn... is it curvey... what's the topography of Poplar Road at that location?

Mr. Geouge: It's... I believe along the frontage, it's relatively flat, but there is a slight curve. So, right here where a shared driveway would normally be provided at the common property line, I think visibility is actually pretty good there. And what I hear from the applicant, visibility is also pretty good at the existing driveway entrance.

Mr. Randall: Okay, so do we expect that that... that won't be shared, right? Where do they... is there a location where you think that driveway is going to be?

Mr. Geouge: The flat area for parcel 27-18E is generally here, so would expect it would be, you know, in this zone somewhere.

Mr. Randall: Somewhere near the property line...

Mr. Geouge: Probably somewhere near the common property line.

Mr. Randall: Okay, alright, thank you.

Mr. English: Anybody else? Okay, thank you Mr. Geouge. Oh, you have a question?

Mr. Bain: Yes, just one. The easement that would be used for parcel A, is that developed or is it wooded right now? Do you know?

Mr. Geouge: There is a single residence on the property that that easement runs through. Actually, the easement originally followed this edge of the property line and it was a 50-foot wide easement. But the applicant negotiated with this owner to change it to this side and reduce the width.

Mr. Bain: Okay. But you don't know whether it's wooded or what it might be.

Mr. Geouge: It's...

Mr. Bain: We can ask the...

Mr. Geouge: Yeah, I think it is primarily wooded with a home up front near Stefagina.

Mr. Bain: Okay, alright.

Mr. English: Anybody else? Anybody else? Okay, thank you Brian. Mr. Jessup would you like to come up and speak to your application.

Mr. Jessup: I thank you very much...

Mr. English: Come on up to the podium and... wait until he cleans it real quick and then you can...

Mr. Geouge: Do we have cleaning stuff? I see a rag but no spray.

Mr. English: I think Mr. Cummings has it. You got it Mr. Cummings.

Mr. Bain: Somebody stole the spray.

Mr. English: That stuff is like gold, man.

Mr. Geouge: It has been for a while, right?

Mr. English: All we ask you to do is state your name and your address and if you want to address the Board, then now is the time to do so. And if we have any questions, we will ask you. So, just state your name and your address and if you have anything to say to us.

Mr. Jessup: My name is Charles Jessup...

Mr. Randall: Take your mask off.

Mr. English: Yeah, take your... thank you.

Mr. Jessup: My name is Charles Jessup, I live on Poplar Road with my mother, I subdivided this for her to try and help her with some... *inaudible*.

Mr. English: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: Hey Darrell, I can't hear him at all.

Mr. English: He couldn't get to the podium, but hold up for a minute Kristen. He had to stand back because they didn't have any cleaner. Hold on, he will be at the podium in a minute.

Mr. Apicella: This is just ridiculous.

Mr. English: Huh? Okay, now is it good? Come up and start over again.

Mr. Jessup: Okay, my name is Charles Jessup, I live on Poplar Road. Everything that Mr. Geouge has stated is correct. The driveway for 27-18E, I was planning on bringing in right at the common property line for 27-18, because right there is where the hill crests and goes down. So, I would want to put it there for vision reasons.

Mr. English: Gotcha, okay. Does anybody have an...

Mr. Jessup: Other than that, I think everything was covered.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Randall: I have a quick question. Is this all family subdivisions? Subdivided for family purposes?

Mr. Jessup: Umm, well, we are going to sell the two lots.

Mr. Randall: Sell their other two lots?

Mr. Jessup: And I am going to keep... my mother is going to keep 27-18 and then I am going to build a house on 27-18E.

Mr. Randall: Okay, thank you.

Mr. English: Mr. Bain, do you have a question?

Mr. Bain: Just to confirm, you said that that easement for parcel A is pretty much wooded right now.

Mr. Jessup: Yes sir, it is wooded.

Mr. Bain: Okay, I just was curious. I didn't drive out there for this. Thank you.

Mr. English: Okay. Kristen do you have any questions? Kristen?

Ms. Barnes: Not at this time. I am good, thank you Darrell.

Mr. English: Okay. Mr. Cummings, anybody else have any questions?

Mr. Cummings: No.

Mr. English: Okay, thank you sir. Alright, I am going to call this back in, since this is in my area, I am going to turn the gavel over to Mr. Randall and then he can call for a vote.

Mr. Randall: So, Mr. English, this is in your district. What would you like to do?

Mr. English: I make a motion that we approve WA1... I mean WAI20153486, Jessup Frontage Waiver. I make a motion to approve.

Mr. Randall: Do we have a second?

Mr. Randall: Second it.

Mr. Randall: Alright, the motion has been made by Mr. English and seconded by Mr. Cummings.

Mr. McPherson: Can I make a comment or ask a question before we proceed?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. McPherson: I believe the applicant, per the requirement, needs to specify what... why this would cause... if we didn't pass this, would cause any disadvantages. If I remember reading the....

Mr. English: You mean any hardship?

Mr. McPherson: Any hardship? I think we need so specifications on why this would cause a hardship if it was not passed. Darrell, is that...

Mr. English: Is there a reason... come on up front.

Mr. McPherson: I just want to make sure that I am doing the right thing. I think that is a requirement

Mr. Jessup: You can only serve two lots off of a 20-foot easement, how can I run a road through here to serve one, two, three, four lots off of a 20-foot easement?

Mr. McPherson: Okay.

Mr. Jessup: Also, where the drainfields are located, they are not able to be moved, so the way the lots are situated is kinda how is has to be to make everything work.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, so it's basically the easement width and the drainfield location prevents the one driveway from serving them all.

Mr. Jessup: Yes sir.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Jessup: Yes sir.

Mr. McPherson: I just wanted to make sure we met the requirements.

Mr. Jessup: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Randall: Alright, do we have any other questions, any other comments, discussion? Alright, it has been moved and seconded. Let's get a vote. Kristen Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Apicella? Mr. Randall says yes. Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Can you hear me? I'm on my phone. I'm watching it on tv. Can you hear me?

Mr. Randall: We can hear you. And your vote is?

Mr. Apicella: There is a slight delay from the tv to the phone, but I vote yes.

Mr. Randall: Vote yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English, would you go ahead and keep chairing the meeting, since there is a delay on my end.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Randall: Alright, Mr. Vice Chair, the motion passes 7-0.

Mr. English: Thank you sir. Okay, moving on to the next business, is Downtown Stafford. That is for your Mr. Harvey.

3. <u>Downtown Stafford</u> - Authorize public hearings for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and a Zoning Ordinance Text amendment regarding the UD-5, Urban Development, Zoning District, and a zoning reclassification application for approximately 29 acres to the UD-5 Zoning District, in the Courthouse Planning Area. (**Time Limit: February 12, 2021**)

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is going to be a briefing by Kathy Baker on the proposals for a comprehensive plan amendment, a rezoning and a zoning text amendment for part of Downtown

Stafford. However, the zoning ordinance amendment would affect other... would be eligible for other areas of the county where we have targeted growth areas.

Ms. Baker: Good evening everyone. Kathy Baker, Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning. May I have the computer please? I am going to give a more of a high-level overview of the Downtown Stafford initiative. And I am sure there will be questions and we will have opportunity to get more in depth as we go on with this. I am going to start with some background. The Courthouse Urban Development Area Plan has really been in development since 2008. And this focus has been on a potential for a "downtown" area. The effort has included community workshops and development of a vision for a walkable community with shops and restaurants, amenities, community gathering spaces, and entertainment/cultural areas. This does embody work, live and play concept and would serve as a signature destination for the County. The new I-95 interchange at Courthouse Road has changed the road network in this area and the make up of the area. There is also a new Courthouse and the need for additional parking which has further shaped the discussion for this area. And then there has been consideration of public-private partnerships to help with the infrastructure and goals in achieving and building an urban center. In 2012, the Board adopted an Urban Development Zoning District permitting the mixed uses, including high density development. A small area plan was also adopted, and that is what you see to the right. The small area plan is encompasses more than just the general downtown area that we will be talking about today, with varying sectors and quardrants as part of this plan. This is the general area we will be focusing on today. In 2016, the Comp Plan identified the Courthouse area as a Targeted Growth Area. You will see the... on the map to the right, the blue outline is the entire planning area for the Courthouse Targeted Area (TGA). And the area, where we are looking again, is in the purple, which is primarily mixed-use commercial and residential, as well as some commercial retail and office designation. In 2017, the Board authorized the hiring of a development advisor, called Stantec, to assist with this effort. Based on findings, a vision for the Downtown Stafford was presented, and this includes a walkable, vibrant town center. It includes pedestrian and bicycle amenities. And as I mentioned, a signature "place" that represents Stafford's culture and values. The study and the findings also acknowledged that there is a... the realities of the market include car-dependency as this would not be primarily limited to a walkable town center but, knowing that there would be additional traffic that would be utilizing the area. In 2018, the Board adopted its 2040 Strategic Plan. In that plan the priorities include, incentivize growth in the Targeted Growth Areas. Identifying a location for the Stafford County Museum and Cultural Center and begin construction of first phase of Downtown Stafford through a public-private partnership to enhance Stafford's identity and promote economic development. Since early 2019, staff has working with Stantec and with others to develop the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and a proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment, to assist with carrying out the vision. Then on September 15th, this year, these items were referred to the Planning Commission for consideration, along with a Boardinitiated zoning reclassification for County-owned property and several adjacent properties. So, I will get into a little bit more detail on that. As far as the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, this would adopt a new land use concept plan, which I will show you in a minute as well. It would amend the text to describe certain features of plan. It would also identify recommended public facilities and infrastructure that would help facilitate development in this area. It would also recommend development densities, building heights, and other design standards. As you see, this is the proposed new land use concept plan. And it is focused in the area between I-95, which is the western border, Route 1, to the east. The Courthouse Road, would be to the north of the properties, and Stafford Hospital Center Boulevard. So, that is the primary area, it does include County-owned land north of the Courthouse for the new Courthouse, as well as a connector road and pedestrian bicycle facilities through that area. You will notice the grid street network system throughout the project and also notice several green areas. It does have a focal point for community gathering and outdoor spaces. It

would also be a parking structure, as I mentioned the potential cultural center and also multi-story buildings with garage parking. The Zoning Ordinance amendment would amend the UD, Urban Development-4 and UD-5 zoning districts to support downtown vision. This would include amending development densities to support 4 and 5-story multi-family and mixed-use buildings with internal parking garages. It would also add public parking and parking garages as permitted uses, parking garage would be condition use, and also improves shared parking requirements. It would also address landscaping changes for this particular zoning designation and would address street standards to meet County and VDOT requirements. With regard to the Zoning Reclassification, this does include County properties as well and properties adjacent, known as JPI or Jarrell Properties Incorporated. There are approximately 23 acres that are County owned, and 10 acres would be rezoned from B-2, Urban Commercial, to UD-5. It would be about 13 acres being zoned from B-3, Office, to the UD-5 district. And then approximately 4.29 acres of the JPI property would be rezoned from B-2 to UD-5. There is an additional 1.8 acres of County owned property that was being conveyed to JPI, and that would go from B-2 to UD-5. I will note that the Board authorized the County as the applicant for this rezoning. So, staff is finalizing completion of the actual application and the associated documents that would go with that application. And that would be presented to you all at such time that a public hearing would be held. This shows the zoning parcels, see the blue are the county properties, the yellow are the JPI properties and then the one orange, or whatever color that is, is the 1.8-acre property that would be conveyed to JPI. And this is the generalized development plan that has been developed by Stantec. This is just a conceptual layout, there is a more in-depth plan that I believe was included in your packet. This area, in red, are the JPI properties on this GDP.

Mr. English: Kathy, is that referred to Fountain Park?

Ms. Baker: Fountain Park...

Mr. English: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Baker: ... you may have also heard that reference. And this just shows the rezoning parcels overlaid on the concept plan with... you will see the rezoning parcels shaded up to the top right corner. I will also note you all recently approved the rezoning and proffer amendment, conditional use permit for property called Burns Corner, and that is in the red properties that you see to the left side of your screen. And this is just a closer in concept for the Burns Corner, that is scheduled to go to the Board of Supervisors, I believe, in December. So, the next steps would be, at such time that the Planning Commission wishes to authorize a public hearing for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment as well and the Zoning Text Amendment. Both of these items have deadline of February 12th for PC action. I will note that the latest Planning Commission meeting prior to that deadline is February 10th. So, we would need to look at authorizing a public hearing really no later than the January meeting, in order to meet that deadline. With regard to the Zoning Reclassification, a public hearing would also be held. There is no specific deadline as far... the same as the Comp Plan and Zoning Text Amendment, but we will note that there is a contractual obligation with JPI to have the rezoning completed by July 9th. So, this could be scheduled at the same time as the other two items. And as I noted, staff is reviewing and gathering the comments from other departments as well as outside agencies, such as VDOT, to get input on the actual rezoning. So, at this point what we are looking for then is how the Planning Commission would like to proceed, as far as scheduling a public hearing. Obviously, you want to get more details on this, and so we could spend the next, however many meetings you all wish, to make sure all your questions are answered, see if you have additional changes that you are looking to make, potentially on the zoning text amendment.

Mr. English: Okay, thank you Kathy. Mr. Harvey, do you have anything to say? Any... *inaudible*... for that right now?

Mr. Harvey: No Mr. Chairman, again as Ms. Baker said we are looking for guidance from the Commission on how you want to approach this.

Mr. English: Okay, I think there's a couple of ways that I think we can do this. We can continue, they can continue... they can just keep bringing this back to us and just giving us an update and maybe in December, we can maybe schedule something as a public hearing. Or we could do a sub-committee, which...

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English, can you hear me?

Mr. English: Yeah, I can hear you, go ahead.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so I am trying a different way of getting in. I think I am successful, finally.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: If you don't mind, I will probably try to take the meeting back over.

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: There is also an additional way. So, I think there are a couple of options, we have a meeting in November, we could dig deeper then. We could, as you say, put this to a sub-committee, we could establish a working meeting. So, what's the pleasure of the Commission going forward? Recognizing that we have got to get this done by February, and if we work backwards we would need to schedule this for a public hearing no later than January 12th. We have one meeting in November, right now, and we have one meeting in December. Our November meeting, I think, is the 18th and I don't have the schedule in front of me for December. But I think it is before the 20th, it might be the 9th. So, again what do folks think we should do in terms of moving this forward. The biggest piece, I think, of course is the actual change to the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Harvey, correct me if I am wrong, I don't think there is really much we could do with the rezoning, since the applicant is the County itself, and there are no proffers and the GDP is not proffered.

Mr. Harvey: That is correct Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Apicella: So, any thoughts?

Mr. Randall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have...

Mr. McPherson: Go ahead Bart.

Mr. Randall: I guess my thought would be is that, you know we have lots of different sub-committees going on and I think the discussion should include everyone. So, with only one meeting in November and one meeting in December, I am going to move that we have another meeting, just as a working meeting that talks about this specifically. So, we can discuss it as a group and then be ready in our meeting in December to move this forward.

Mr. Apicella: So, with that said I am going to ask Kathy, do you expect... if we were to put this back on the agenda in November, are there any more details that you think we would have by then, to schedule a working session sometime thereafter. Or would it be prudent to do one before then? I am just trying to find out how much more, you said that you were gathering some more information from other departments. I think that we asked for, and the Board agreed that we would put all three of these pieces together so they weren't looked at individually and it still makes sense to do that going forward. So, again I just want to get a sense from staff, what... *inaudible*... the possible in terms of additional information.

Ms. Baker: So, the additional information we are compiling is strictly related to the rezoning. You all have the comprehensive plan amendment in your package. You have the Zoning text amendment already in your packages. So, at this point it would be a matter of looking at those two items. The comp plan amendment portion, really, we are bound to the concept plans that we have. Those have been developed through the process with our consultants. There may be some language that perhaps you want to look to modify, as far as the comprehensive plan amendment. But the zoning text amendment, whether you have questions for that. Whether you have additional changes that you would like to see, that's probably going to be the biggest piece of this. The rezoning classification, we basically have the application, it's just a matter of getting input particularly from VDOT. We had a meeting with them last week, now that this was already moving forward. They indicated that they could potentially have comments to us by our meeting in January. January 13th is that meeting that would have to authorize a public hearing for these items to make the February 10th meeting. So, it may take us up to that point to have all of the comments back, related to the transportation. The transportation comments are going to be general, they are going to be more overview, they will not be specific as an in-depth traffic impact analysis has not been conducted. But we do have that information, we have a traffic... basically the traffic counts that have been conducted already for the area and additional information we can get you that information, we already have that. But it is basically the comments that we would be getting, going through at the standard DRM, Development Review Meeting process with our other agencies to make sure everything is complete.

Mr. Apicella: So, I am sorry, go ahead Kathy.

Ms. Baker: I was just going to say we will have the, I guess I don't know when we will have the Development Review meeting. It may not be until December, until we have that information. But, having said that, if the public hearings occur at the same time the... even though you need to have action on the comp plan amendment and the zoning text amendment, the rezoning application could be deferred for further discussion, if that needs to happen. That will be dependent upon the other two items going forward. So, if there are changes to those, that could impact the rezoning, then we have additional time to have a deferral on that item.

Mr. Bain: Kathy, just... can you bring back up the map showing the rezoning areas and the rest of the town... that one, yes. Right, so only the crosshatched with the black lines is what this rezoning applies to.

Ms. Baker: Correct.

Mr. Bain: The other areas, that are not in the Burns Corner area, will they require rezoning at some point? Or are they already urban... a UD-5 category?

Ms. Baker: They would need to be rezoned by other individuals at some point.

Mr. Bain: Okay, those are not owned by the County, they are a number of individual land owners there?

Ms. Baker: Correct, and I think that we included in your package, I did not put it in this presentation, but it does have the owners of those properties south of the rezoning area up to Stafford Boulevard... Stafford Hospital Boulevard.

Mr. Bain: I am just thinking, if anyone of those land owners doesn't like the plan, it could really scuttle the whole thing, in my mind.

Ms. Baker: Well the concept plan would show what the proposed... proposal is for that area. So, the intent is this original rezoning is going to jumpstart the development of the rest of the area.

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Ms. Baker: And any of the rezoning potentials would be subject to the new ordinance, if that was the way that they chose to go.

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Ms. Baker: But it does not guarantee that every property is going to come in and develop at our recommendation to follow the concept plan.

Mr. Bain: Sure, sure. Okay, I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: So, I am not hearing anyone opposed to doing a working session. Again, we meet on the 18th, our only meeting in November. We obviously normally meet on a Wednesday. So, just to throw out a couple of options here. We could potentially get together on November 11th, again assuming the Board Chambers is available. I don't think anyone would want to meet on November 25th, because that should be Thanksgiving week. Moving forward, we have got December 2nd open, our next actual meeting in December is December 9th and then we have December 16th. Does any of those dates look good for anybody if we were to hold a work session?

Ms. Baker: I am going to note that the County offices are closed on the 11th for Veterans Day.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so that is out. So, either the 2^{nd} ... Jeff do you have a sense of how busy the agenda is for December 9^{th} ?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, we haven't quite gotten December 9th nailed down yet, but we know for the November meeting we are going to have four public hearings.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so that potentially puts us at... again assuming we were going to do it on a regular Wednesday. That does not mean it has to be that way, but December 16th would be the next date after that.

Mr. McPherson: I think I would prefer December 2nd myself.

Mr. Randall: I am for December 2nd.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Does December 2nd work for everybody.

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: It works for me.

Mr. Cummings: Yes, that's fine.

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so I think what you are hearing Jeff and Kathy is a consensus to do a work session. Presumably we do the same start time, at 4:30 in the Board Chambers with folks participating remotely as they need too.

Ms. Lucian: Since you have time to have a special meeting, I would recommend that you make a motion to establish the date.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, somebody make a motion...

Mr. Randall: Yes, I make a motion that we plan to have a Stafford... Downtown Stafford working session December 2nd at 4:30 pm.

Me. Apicella: Is there a second?

Unknown: Inaudible.

Mr. Apicella: I heard a second from somebody.

Mr. Cummings: Cummings seconded.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks Mr. Cummings. Any further comments Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: No.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: No.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else. Okay, just do a quick roll call vote. Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Apicella votes yes. Okay, that motion carries unanimously. Alright, the next item on the agenda, Mr. Harvey, Planning Directors Report.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

4. Amendment to Adopt Senior Housing Guidelines and Amend Senior Housing Parking Requirements – BOS Referral

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman, the Board of Supervisors recently sent down, at the Planning Commission's request, the Senior Housing Guidelines that the Commission developed. That would be an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, specifically an add on to our existing Neighborhood Design Standards. Also, the Board acknowledged the Commission's concern about parking for senior housing and ask the Commission to come up with alternatives. So, staff would recommend we discuss this at the next Planning Commission meeting. Specifically, with regard to the parking alternatives.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks Mr. Harvey. So, there is two pieces here, we've got the Comp Plan Amendment associated with the Senior Housing Guidelines. Nothing was changed, Mr. Harvey, from what we presented to the Board?

Mr. Harvey: Correct, nothing was changed.

Mr. Apicella: And the other piece are the parking guidelines. Can you be a little bit more specific about what you are looking for there?

Mr. Harvey: Well Mr. Chairman, the Commission at the time acknowledged that they felt that the parking standards were too low for retirement housing and was suggesting that it be changed, possibly to two parking spaces per dwelling unit. But there are a variety of different dwelling units that are permitted in retirement communities. So, the Commission may want to look at having a variety of different parking standards based on the housing unit types. That is something we can discuss with the Commission at the next meeting.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, can you come... can you provide some recommendations at that next meeting?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: Alright. So, we would not be able to move forward on that tonight on that piece of it. We could potentially move forward with scheduling a public hearing for the Senior Housing

Guidelines. Does the Commission prefer to sit on this for a little bit longer or to go forward with what we have now?

Mr. English: I think we should just go ahead and move forward with what we have now.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks Mr. English. Anybody else?

Mr. Bain: Wouldn't it make sense to have them both at the same public hearing?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, just a point of clarification, the Senior Housing Guidelines, since it is part of a Comprehensive Plan amendment, it's subject to a 60-day time limitation by State Code whereas the Planning Commission has to take action within 60 days. So, that would be something to consider as you discuss whether to take it up jointly with the parking amendment or not.

Mr. Apicella: I guess my sense is having worked on it, I don't know that there is a direct connection between the guidelines and the parking requirements. My sense is that we could do those separately. Mr. Cummings and Mr. Randall, do you have any thoughts on that since you also worked on the Sub-Committee?

Mr. Cummings: Yeah, I am comfortable with separating the two. So, we can keep moving forward. I think the Senior Housing piece is pretty complete and I think... yeah, I am comfortable with just treating them separately.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yeah, I hate to be the odd man out here. My feeling is that we wrap it all up in a bow all together. That pretty much the comprehensive plan changes are pretty much done. We have already voted on it. The staff... the Commission has already voted on it. Literally, there is nothing to talk about. We would just literally be submitting it for a public hearing. And so, I think if we wait one more week, we have a discussion about the parking on the 18th, we at that point in time submit it for a public hearing that would happen in December. Mr. Harvey, does that meet our time line if we have a public hearing in December?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir, because it would be 60 days from today.

Mr. Randall: Sixty days from today. So, that would be my recommendation. Instead of doing the public hearing on the 18th, talking about it and then, I guess we would have to have a public hearing on the parking as well.

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Randall: So, we would have to have two separate public hearings. I think we just put them together. We talk about the parking on the 18th and then we have a dual public hearing on the 9th in December. I think we can get away with only having to address this once.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I have heard one person say we should wait until the 18th, I have heard two people say we should move forward. I would like a little bit more feedback from the rest of the Commission to decide where we should go and put forward a motion here.

Mr. Bain: I said, I think they should be combined and dealt with in a single public hearing, because they both pertain to senior housing.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Sorry, I am getting there. The organizational part of me really likes having them together. So, I would probably come down on that side.

Mr. McPherson: Agreed.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, anybody else? Anybody want to put a motion... actually we don't need a motion because it's Planning Directors Report so we can probably just do this by consensus. If I could hear from a couple more folks and we can go with whatever the majority decides to do. Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Can you hear me?

Mr. Apicella: I think you were suggesting that we do them together.

Mr. Bain: Can you hear me? For some reason my microphone is not working.

Mr. Apicella: Can you hear me?

Mr. English: Yes, it is.

Mr. Apicella: Can you hear me?

Mr. English: Can you hear Mr. Bain, Steven?

Ms. Barnes: Yeah Steven, I got you. You are coming through loud and clear.

Ms. Lucian: You can try this one.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I am not seeing anybody in the chambers.

Mr. Bain: Steve, Steve. Can you hear me?

Mr. English: He is gone. What is the consensus are we going to do them together? Is that what we are going to do?

Mr. Bain: That is my consensus.

Mr. English: Is that okay with you Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English, can you hear me?

Mr. English: Yes, we got it Steven. Did you hear us. Okay, we are going to go ahead and just do it together. Alright? Kristen, did you hear us? Kristen... we lost her too. Technology. Okay, Jeff is that it on you?

Mr. Harvey: No sir. I also wanted to remind the Commission that tomorrow night at 6:30 PM the Commission has a joint hearing....

Mr. Apicella: Kristen, can you hear...

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: ... on an item that....

Mr. Apicella: Can you hear folks from the chambers?

Ms. Barnes: No.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I have had to turn on my tv. They are moving on to the next item.

Ms. Barnes: I am texting Darrell.

Mr. English: Go ahead.

Mr. Harvey: Again, to remind the Commission that tomorrow there will be a joint public hearing...

Mr. Apicella: Darrell, can you hear us?

Mr. Harvey: ... on two items.

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: The Healthy Growth amendments as well as the Cemetery Ordinance. The Cemetery Ordinance is a new item that the Commission...

Ms. Barnes: They don't... are they still going on?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah.

Mr. Harvey: ... may not be aware of.

Mr. Randall: Turn them off.

Ms. Barnes: I texted Darrell. And they can hear us it says. Okay. We can't see you it just has yellow, like a little yellow square or yellow triangle that says you are offline.

Mr. English: Go ahead Jeff.

Mr. Harvey: Again Mr. Chairman, there will be a proposed amendment to the cemetery provisions of our County Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, to repeal the provision dealing with the location and establishment of cemeteries...

Ms. Barnes: Steven, he said they are moving on.

Mr. Harvey: ... so that would in effect default to state code. I just wanted to make the Commission aware that that's another public hearing for tomorrow night.

Mr. English: Okay, thank you Jeff.

Mr. Harvey: You are welcome.

Mr. English: Is that it sir?

Mr. Harvey: And that concludes my report.

Mr. English: Okay. County Attorney?

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. Lucian: Good evening Planning Commission, I have no report.

Mr. English: Thank you. Okay, moving on to Committee Reports, Healthy Growth Subcommittee, we are meeting on the... that is tomorrow night, I am sorry, meeting on the 29th. The public hearing at Colonial Forge High School. Land Conservation Subcommittee is going to be November 5th at 3 o'clock in the Activities Room. The Cluster Ordinance Subcommittee meeting summary, do you just want to give that?

COMMITTEE REPORTS

- 5. Healthy Growth Subcommittee

 Next Meeting October 29, 2020 Joint BOS-PC Public Hearing
- 6. Land Conservation Subcommittee

 Next Meeting November 5, 2020 @ 3:00 PM, Activities Room
- 7. Cluster Ordinance Subcommittee

 Meeting Summary

 Next Meeting TBD

Mr. Randall: Yes. I will give you a quick summary. So, we had a quick... we had our first meeting. We pretty much scoped what we were going to be working on and put together some goals of what we wanted to come out with. And we will be having our next meeting on November 12th at 3:00 pm over here in the County Community Center, or the County Courthouse area.

Mr. English: Okay. Thank you, Bart is that it?

Mr. Randall: That's it.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. English: Okay. Steven, the Chairman's Report... Steven can you hear us at all? Okay? In the other business, new TRC Submissions, none right? None? Okay, we need to approve the minutes for August 26th. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes for August 26th?

OTHER BUSINESS

8. New TRC Submissions - *None*

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

9. August 26, 2020

Mr. Bain: So moved.

Mr. English: Motion made by Mr. Bain. Is there a second?

Mr. Cummings: Seconded.

Mr. English: Seconded by Mr. Cummings. Mr. Bain do you have any questions?

Mr. Bain: No.

Mr. English: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: No.

Mr. English: Bart, do you want to call roll please.

Mr. Randall: Yes. Ms. Barnes? Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Bart Randall says yes. Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Apicella can you hear us? Alright passes six...

Mr. Apicella: Yeah.

Mr. Randall: Yes, there he is. Passes all.

Mr. English: Thank you Mr. Randall. Okay, I need a motion for the minutes, approval of minutes for

September 9, 2020.

Mr. McPherson: So moved.

Mr. English: Mr. McPherson was the first to motion. Is there a second?

Mr. Randall: I will second that.

Mr. English: Seconded by Mr. Randall. Any questions Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Nope.

Mr. English: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: No.

Mr. English: Okay, call for the question Mr. Randall.

10. September 9, 2020

Mr. Randall: Yes. Ms. Barnes? Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Bart Randall says yes. Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Apicella? Ms. Barnes?

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Mr. English: Okay, motion passed.

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. English: Okay, at this time I motion for adjournment at 5:22.

<u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 5:22 PM.